

Appl. No. 10/660,023  
Amdt. dated Feb. 22, 2005  
Reply to Office action of Nov. 19, 2004

## REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated November 19, 2004, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 14, 16 and 20 have been canceled, without prejudice, claims 15 and 17 have been amended. The Examiner's indication that claims 1-13 are allowed and claims 15 and 17-19 contain allowable subject matter is gratefully acknowledged. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

### *Drawing Objections*

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in claims 1 and 2. Specifically, the Examiner has stated that the subject matter of claims 1 and 2 stating "the plurality of inverters comprise a first inverter receiving the input ON/OFF signal from the external device and a second inverter receiving the input ON/OFF signal from one of the plurality of inverters" and "the inverters are connected in series" is not shown in the drawings.

Applicant respectfully points out, referring to FIG. 4, that the plurality of inverters (81, 82, 83 and 84) each include a delay block (811, 821, 831 and 841) and an inverter block (812, 822, 832 and 842). FIG. 4 shows an output from a node at a first inverter (81) as an input ON/OFF signal to the delay block (821) of a second inverter (82). Thus, the input ON/OFF signal for the second inverter is received from the first inverter. Furthermore, each inverter shown as dotted line blocks (81, 82, 83 and 84), is connected in series with each subsequent inverter shown as a dotted line block by a solid line proceeding from a node of each inverter to the delay block of each subsequent inverter. Thus, FIG. 4 shows the inverters connected in series.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider objections to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a).

### *Claim Objections*

Claims 15 and 17-19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Appl. No. 10/660,023  
Amdt. dated Feb. 22, 2005  
Reply to Office action of Nov. 19, 2004

Claims 15 and 17 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Thus, claims 15 and 17 are believed allowable. Claims 18 and 19 depend directly from claim 17, thus include all the limitations of claim 17. Thus, claims 18 and 19 are believed to be allowable.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the objections to claims 15 and 17-19.

***Rejected Claims***

Applicant has canceled rejected claims 14, 16 and 20 without prejudice, thus the rejections to these claims are moot.

Appl. No. 10/660,023  
Amdt. dated Feb. 22, 2005  
Reply to Office action of Nov. 19, 2004

***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By:   
Chad L. Thorson  
Reg. No. 55,675  
Confirmation No. 5903  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: February 22, 2005

Page 7 of 7

YOM-0059/OPP021137US